



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,163	06/27/2003	Christophe Magnin	2058.ELO	8268

7590 07/21/2005
Thomas F. Roland
NATIONAL STARCH AND CHEMICAL COMPANY
P.O. Box 6500
Bridgewater, NJ 08807-0500

EXAMINER

YAO, SAMCHUAN CUA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1733

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/608,163

Applicant(s)

MAGNIN ET AL.

Examiner

Sam Chuan C. Yao

Art Unit

1733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6-27-3&10-15-4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2, 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Rinchart et al (US 5,827,608). See abstract, col. 1 lines 7-10; col. 2 lines 9-43; col. 4 line 31 to col. 5 line 19; col. 6 lines 8-60; claims 1 and 10; figures 1-2 and 4.
3. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Akasaki et al (US 4,859,266). See abstract; col. 1 line 43 to col. 2 line 45; figures 1,3, and 5.
4. Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sprengling (US 4,496,415). See abstract; col. 2 lines 14-57; col. 3 line 34 to col. 4 line 61; claims 1-3; figure.
5. Claims 1-2 and 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by WO 03/076083 A1.
6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parker et al (US 5,928,721).

Parker et al discloses a thermoplastic powder coated non-metallic fabric, wherein the thermoplastic powder is heated to melt-fuse the thermoplastic powder (abstract; col. 3 line 28 to col. 4 line 47; figure 1).

It is acknowledge that, Parker et al does not disclose electrostatically depositing thermoplastic powder onto a fabric. However, it is now well settled, *"If the product in the product by process claim is the same as or obvious from the product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process."* In re Thorpe, 777 f.2d 695,698,227 USPQ 964 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Moreover, "The Patent Office bears a lesser burden of proof in making out a case of prima facie obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature" than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. In re Fessmann, 489 F2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974). Once the Examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. In re Marosi, 710 F.2d 798, 802,218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinchart et al (US 5,827,608) as applied to claim 1 above.

While Rinchart et al does not explicitly disclose adhering a finished composite comprising a non-metallic substrate and a thermoplastic layer onto another substrate, the teachings of Rinchart et al as a whole would have suggested to one in the art that the finished composite is adhered onto another substrate by heat-activating the thermoplastic layer, since Rinchart et al is directed to making a composite for use as an *"outdoor durable sign"*. In any event, it would have been obvious in the art to adhere a heat-activated thermoplastic layer of a composite having a graphic/marketing substrate layer onto a metallic or non-metallic outdoor post as such is conventional in the art.

9. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinchart et al (US 5,827,608) as applied to claim 1 above, and optionally further in view of WO 00/05275 A1.

With respect to claim 3, a solvent activated powder adhesive comprising a polymer having cationic functionality is old in the art. In fact, such an adhesive is commercially available as evidence from Applicant's own disclosure. See for example 3, where a polymer powder having a cationic core (**ELOTEx Flex 8300**) is disclosed. Moreover and optionally, it is old in the art to form a water redispersible powder comprising a polymer having a cationic functionality where it can be used as an adhesive as exemplified in the teachings of WO '275. It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 1733

in the art to replace a heat-activated thermoplastic powder with a solvent activated cationic polymeric powder for bonding a pair of fabrics in a process taught by Akasaki et al. None, but only the expected result of providing an activatable powder adhesive for bonding fabric layers would have been achieved.

With respect to claim 6, while Akasaki et al teaches applying and bonding a second fabric to a heat-activated thermoplastic powder adhesive coating on a 1st fabric (figure 5), Akasaki et al does not teach simultaneously depositing and heat-activating a thermoplastic powder adhesive. However, such would have been obvious in the art, because, absent any showing of unexpected benefit, a preference on whether to simultaneously or to sequentially deposit and activate thermoplastic powder for bonding a pair of fabrics is taken to be well within the purview of choice in the art. There is none, but only the expected result of at least softening a thermoplastic powder by heat so that the thermoplastic powder becomes tacky would have been achieved.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Chuan C. Yao whose telephone number is (571) 272-1224. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday with second Friday off.

Art Unit: 1733

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine Copenheaver can be reached on (571) 272-1156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sam Chuan C. Yao
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1733

Scy
07-18-05